



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,517	04/09/2004	Anatoliy V. Tsyrzanovich	ZIL-537-1P	9858
47713	7590	06/23/2005	EXAMINER	
SILICON EDGE LAW GROUP LLP 6601 KOLL CENTER PARKWAY, SUITE 245 PLEASANTON, CA 94566			MAI, LAM T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2819	

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/821,517	Applicant(s) TSYRGANOVICH, ANATOLIY V.	
	Examiner LAM T. MAI	Art Unit 2819	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,7-9,14,20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-6,10-13,15-19,22 and 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/9/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/9/04 has been considered by the examiner.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 3 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6839010.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because their functionality are similar.

Claims 1 and 3 and 7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6839010. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because their functionality are similar.

Claims 1 and 3 and 8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6839010. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because their functionality are similar.

Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6839010.

Claim 14 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6839010. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to eliminate "determining a filter control value" step at the time of the invention and the functionality of conflicting claim are still similar.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6839010. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the functionality of conflicting claims are very similar.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 4-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they would be considered for allowable if they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claimed features of claims 2 and 4-6 fail to fairly teach or suggest in the prior art.

Claims 10-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they would be considered for allowable if they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claimed features of claims 10-13 fail to fairly teach or suggest in the prior art.

Claims 15-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they would be considered for allowable if they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claimed features of claims 15-19 fail to fairly teach or suggest in the prior art.

Claims 22-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but they would be considered for allowable if they are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claimed features of claims 22-23 fail to fairly teach or suggest in the prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAM T. MAI whose telephone number is (571)272-1807. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pascal J. Robert can be reached on (571) 272-1769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lam Mai', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Lam T. Mai
Art Unit 2819